



Annex to 2010 Association of Bay Area
Governments (ABAG)

**Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
(MJ-LHMP)**

Taming Natural Disasters

City of Clayton

6000 Heritage Trail

Clayton, CA 94517



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
The Regional Planning Process.....	3
The Local Planning Process.....	4
Review and Incorporation of Existing Information	4
Process of Updating Plan Sections	5
Public Meetings	5
Hazards Assessment	5
Past Occurrences of Disasters (Natural and Human-Induced).....	6
Risk Assessment	6
Urban Land Exposure	6
Infrastructure Exposure.....	7
Exposure of City-Owned Buildings, Plus Critical Healthcare Facilities and Schools	8
Repetitive Loss Properties	10
Other Risks.....	10
National Flood Insurance Program.....	10
Mitigation Goals and Objectives	10
Mitigation Activities and Priorities	11
Evaluation of Progress from 2005 Plan	11
Future Mitigation Actions and Priorities	11
Ongoing Mitigation Strategy Programs	12
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms.....	19
Plan Update Process.....	20
Mitigation Plan Points of Contact.....	21
Exhibit A – Jurisdiction Boundary Map.....	22
Exhibit B – Public Meeting Announcements	23
Exhibit C – City of Clayton Mitigation Strategies.....	24



Introduction

The City of Clayton is a small city in Contra Costa County, California. The City has a population of approximately 11,000 people, based on the 2000 census.¹ The City's total budget for FY 2009/2010 was \$9,083,363, of which its General Fund budget was \$3,637,679. The City employs only 27 people to provide the services of a general law city in California. While the City provides local law enforcement services, area fire service and emergency medical responses are supplied by a separate fire district and a private ambulance company, respectively.

The Regional Planning Process

The City of Clayton participated in various Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) workshops, conferences and meetings, including the following:

- Regional Planning Committee Meeting: August 6, 2008;
- Regional Planning Committee Meeting: October 1, 2008;
- Regional Planning Committee Meeting: December 3, 2008;
- Regional Planning Committee Meeting: April 1, 2009;
- LHMP City-County Workshop: May 8, 2009;
- LHMP Housing & Outreach Committee Meeting: May 27, 2009;
- LHMP Wildfire Workshop: July 2, 2009;
- LHMP Flooding Workshop: July 7, 2009;
- Regional Planning Committee Meeting: August 5, 2009;
- Executive Board Meeting: September 17, 2009;
- Regional Planning Committee Meeting: October 7, 2009; and
- LHMP Annex Writing Workshop: July 28, 2010.

For more information on these meetings and for rosters of attendees, please see Appendix A and H in the ABAG Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJ-LHMP). In addition, the City of Clayton provided information on facilities that are defined as "critical" to ABAG. The City also held a publicly noticed Clayton City Council meeting on September 1, 2009, to invite public comment on the plan and has continuously solicited public input on the City of Clayton website since September 2009.

¹ For complete Census information on this city, see <http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/>.



The Local Planning Process

Representatives from multiple City departments met on a regular basis to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation strategies. Personnel involved in these meetings included senior management and staff from the Engineering, Maintenance and Police Departments. The group was made up of planners, facility managers, civil engineers, emergency managers and police officials.

David Woltering, Senior Planner, was assigned as lead staff for the 2010 Update. Mr. Woltering reviewed the initial information from ABAG and FEMA, identified key issues in the 2010 Strategies Matrix and coordinated the review by other departments of the Strategies Matrix. Two team meetings were held to coordinate the City's response. Participating senior staff and their roles included:

Dan Lawrence, Chief of Police, coordinates the City of Clayton's EOC program. He provided input on emergency and natural disaster response procedures and issues including radio interoperability and the operation of the City's Emergency Operating Center. Chief Lawrence also arranged for training to ensure that City staff involved in preparation of the LHMP understood local procedures.

Rick Angrisani, City Engineer, provided input on the proposed Strategies Matrix in relation to engineering and maintenance issues. Gary Napper, City Manager, and Laura Hoffmeister, Assistant to the City Manager, also attended the meeting to provide oversight and assist with priority delegation. The staff team reviewed the proposed Strategies Matrix and provided comments and rankings on the suitability of the strategies and policies for the City of Clayton.

At the first meeting, general priorities and appropriate departments were identified. Subsequent meetings identified mitigation strategies, prioritized said strategies, and reviewed preliminary budgets and potential funding sources for strategies designated as "High" priority for City-owned and -operated facilities.

No formal meeting agendas, minutes, or sign-in sheets were prepared during the staff team process. The City of Clayton's approach involved a collaborative, informal review and discussion of materials.

Review and Incorporation of Existing Information

The City has several planning mechanisms including the following:

- General Plan Safety Element
- Capital Improvements Plan
- FEMA NFIP Flood Insurance Rate Map 06013C

The City has a Safety Element in its General Plan that includes a discussion of fire, earthquake, flooding and landslide hazards. This plan was adopted as an implementation appendix to the Safety Element. In addition, the City Planning Department enforces the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which,



since 1988, requires mitigation for identified natural hazards. The City has used these pre-existing programs as a basis for identifying gaps that may lead to disaster vulnerabilities in order to work on ways to address these risks through mitigation. Additionally, all proposed projects are reviewed by Planning staff to ensure that no development occurs within base flood elevations to reduce further exposure to flood losses.

Process of Updating Plan Sections

The City of Clayton has taken part in a number of ABAG-hosted plan update workshops and meetings since 2008 and the results of each meeting were disseminated throughout the staff team for review and comment. The City continues to support the ABAG local planning process.

Public Meetings

Opportunity for public comments on the DRAFT mitigation strategies was provided at a public meeting at the September 1, 2009, City Council meeting at 7:00pm and advertised on the City of Clayton website. The draft mitigation strategies were also published on the City of Clayton website and remain available for public viewing and comment, though to date no public comments have been received from either the meeting or the internet posting. Copies of the internet posting are included as **Exhibit B** to the City of Clayton 2010 Annex.

The Clayton City Council will adopt the plan in a public meeting via an official Resolution upon approval by FEMA. The mitigation strategies will become an implementation appendix of the Safety Element of the City of Clayton General Plan.

Hazards Assessment

The ABAG Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, to which this is an annex, lists nine hazards that impact the Bay Area, five related to earthquakes (faulting, shaking, earthquake-induced landslides, liquefaction and tsunamis) and four related to weather (flooding, landslides, wildfires and drought). These hazards also impact this community, except for surface faulting, liquefaction and tsunamis. Surface faulting is not a hazard in the City of Clayton because no active faults are located within the City. While the ABAG Liquefaction Susceptibility Map indicates significant areas within the City as having Very High Susceptibility to Liquefaction, all of the areas indicated have been developed, primarily with residential housing. As part of the development process, soils investigations were undertaken which indicated that the clayey nature of the soils negated the possibility of liquefaction during a seismic event. Tsunamis are not a hazard because the City does not border the Pacific Ocean or any portion of the San Francisco/Suisun Bay. Maps of these hazards and risks are shown on the ABAG website at the following web address: <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/>.

The City of Clayton has reviewed the hazards identified and ranked the hazards based on past disasters and expected future impacts. The conclusion is that earthquakes (particularly shaking), flooding, wildfires and landslides (including unstable earth) pose a significant risk for potential loss.



The City of Clayton does not face any natural disasters not listed in the ABAG multi-jurisdictional plan and new hazards, such as climate change and extreme heat events, have been identified by the City of Clayton since the original development of this plan in 2005.

While the City of Clayton has undertaken a number of general hazard mapping activities since the first Safety Element was prepared by the City, all of these maps are less detailed and are not as current as those shown on the ABAG website at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/>.

Past Occurrences of Disasters (Natural and Human-Induced)

The City of Clayton has experienced a number of different disasters over the last 50 years, including numerous earthquakes, floods, droughts, wildfires, energy shortages, civil disturbances, landslides and severe storms. The Oakland Hills Firestorm of 1991, for example, ranks as one of the worst wildland-urban firestorm disasters to ever strike the United States with 25 deaths, 150 injuries and the displacement of over 10,000 persons. With destruction and damage to over 3,400 residential units, losses were in excess of \$1.5 Billion.

The Loma Prieta Earthquake of 1989 is another example of the kind of large scale disaster which can strike the Bay Area. It killed 63 persons, injured 3,757, and displaced over 12,000 persons. With over 20,000 homes and businesses damaged and over 1,100 destroyed, this quake caused approximately \$6 Billion of damage. Reconstruction continues some two decades later as the replacement for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge is still several years from completion. More information on State and Federally declared disasters in the City of Clayton can be found at the following web address: <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/wp-content/documents/ThePlan-D-2011.pdf>.

In addition to the declared disasters noted in Appendix D, locally significant incidents that have impacted the City of Clayton in the last several years include:

- Localized minor flooding due to creek overflows during winter storms in 1993, 1995 and 1998.

Risk Assessment

Urban Land Exposure

The City of Clayton examined the hazard exposure of the City's urban land based on information in ABAG's website at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/pickdbh2.html>. The "2005 Existing Land Use with 2009 Mapping" file was used for this evaluation (in the existing plan, the file used was "Existing Land Use in 2000").



In general, the hazard exposure of the City of Clayton has remained unchanged over time. There has been an increase of urban land in the 100-year flood zone over the last 5 years due to changes of questionable accuracy in the new FEMA flood maps. The following table describes the exposure of urban land within the City to the various hazards.

Exposure (acres of urban land)			
Hazard	2005	2010	Change
<i>Total Acres of Urban Land</i>	<i>2,059</i>	<i>2,239</i>	<i>180</i>
Earthquake Faulting (within CGS zone) ¹	0	0	0
Earthquake Shaking (within highest two shaking categories)	1	1	0
Earthquake-Induced Landslides (within CGS study zone) ¹	0	0	0
Liquefaction (within moderate, high or very high susceptibility)	600	322	(278)
Flooding (within 100-year floodplain) ²	73	124	51
Flooding (within 500-year floodplain) ²	41	20	(19)
Landslides (within areas of existing landslides)	646	879	233
Wildfire (subject to high, very high or extreme wildfire threat) ³	254	244	(10)
Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Threat	1,762	2,018x	256
Dam Inundation (within inundation zone)	0	0	0
Sea Level Rise ⁴	Not applicable		
Tsunamis (within inundation zone) ⁵	Not applicable		
Drought ⁶	2,059	2,239	180

¹ The City of Clayton is not within the area that has been evaluated by CGS for these hazards to date.

² New digital FEMA mapping claims to provide more accurate accounting of properties with structures in the floodplain.

³ The decrease is due to better and more accurate mapping.

⁴ The sea level rise map is not a hazard map. It is not appropriate to assess infrastructure exposure to sea level rise.

⁵ Tsunami evacuation planning maps were not available inside the San Francisco Bay in 2005. This map became available in December 2009. Acres of exposed land are not an appropriate analysis for this hazard. It should be noted that this map is not a hazard map and should be used for evacuation planning purposes only. The inundation line represents the highest inundation at any particular location from a suite of tsunami sources. It is not representative of any single tsunami.

⁶ The entire area of the City of Clayton is subject to drought.

Infrastructure Exposure

The City of Clayton also examined the hazard exposure of infrastructure within the jurisdiction based on the information on ABAG's website at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/pickdbh2.html>. Of the 57 miles of exposed roads, there are 42 miles of public roads and approximately 5 miles of private roads, and the remaining 10 miles are secondary County Highway roads. The following table describes the exposure of city infrastructure to the various hazards analyzed:



Exposure (miles of infrastructure)						
Hazard	Roadway		Transit & Rail		Pipelines	
	2005	2010	2005	2010	2005	2010
<i>Total Miles of Infrastructure</i>	54	57	0	0	54	56
Earthquake Shaking (within highest two shaking categories)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liquefaction Susceptibility (within moderate, high or very high liquefaction susceptibility)	18	11	0	0	18	11
Liquefaction Hazard (within CGS study zone) ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0
Earthquake-Induced Landslides (within CGS zone) ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0
Earthquake Faulting (within CGS zone) ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flooding (within 100-year floodplain)	2	3	0	0	2	2
Flooding (within 500-year floodplain)	1	1	0	0	1	1
Landslides (within areas of existing landslides)	12	12	0	0	12	11
Wildfires (subject to high, very high or extreme wildfire threat)	4	1	0	0	4	1
Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Threat	47	49	0	0	47	48
Dam Inundation (within inundation zone)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sea Level Rise ²	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tsunamis ³	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drought ⁴	0	0	0	0	0	0

¹ The City of Clayton is not within the area that has been evaluated by CGS for any of these hazards to date.

² The sea level rise map is not a hazard map. It is not appropriate to assess infrastructure exposure to sea level rise.

³ Tsunami evacuation planning maps were not available inside the San Francisco Bay in 2005. This map became available in December 2009. Miles of exposed infrastructure are not an appropriate analysis for this hazard. It should be noted that this map is not a hazard map and should be used for evacuation planning purposes only. The inundation line represents the highest inundation at any particular location from a suite of tsunami sources. It is not representative of any single tsunami.

⁴ Drought is not a hazard for roadways.

Exposure of City-Owned Buildings, Plus Critical Healthcare Facilities and Schools

The City of Clayton examined the hazard exposure of critical health care facilities and schools located within the City of Clayton and City-owned buildings based on the information on ABAG's website at the following web address: <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/pickcrit.html>. The City of Clayton provided a list of the critical facilities it owns to ABAG. ABAG provided a detailed assessment of the hazard exposure of each of its facilities. The following number of facilities is exposed to the various hazards analyzed.



Exposure (number of facility types)								
Hazard	Hospitals		Schools		Locally owned critical facilities		Locally owned bridges and interchanges	
	2005	2010	2005	2010	2005	2010	2005	2010
<i>Total Number of Facilities</i>	0	0	2	3	6	5	1	1
Earthquake Shaking (within highest two shaking categories)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liquefaction Susceptibility (within moderate, high or very high liquefaction susceptibility)	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	1
Liquefaction Hazard (within CGS study zone) ¹	<i>Not mapped for Contra Costa County.</i>							
Earthquake-Induced Landslides (within CGS study zone) ²	<i>Not mapped for Contra Costa County.</i>							
Earthquake Faulting (within CGS zone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flooding (within 100-year floodplain)	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	0
Flooding (within 500-year floodplain)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Landslides (within areas of existing landslides)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildfires (subject to high, very high or extreme wildfire threat)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Threat	0	0	2	3	6	5	0	0
Dam Inundation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sea Level Rise (exposed to 16 inch sea level rise) ³	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sea Level Rise (exposed to 55 inch sea level rise) ⁴	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tsunamis (within inundation area) ⁵	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drought ⁶	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

¹ The California Geological Survey mapping for Contra Costa County has not been completed with CGS study zone for Liquefaction Hazard.

² The California Geological Survey mapping for Contra Costa County has not been completed with CGS study zone for Earthquake Induced Landslides.

³ Sea level rise data was not available in 2005.

⁴ Sea level rise data was not available in 2005.

⁵ Tsunami evacuation planning maps were not available inside the San Francisco Bay in 2005. This map became available in December 2009. Miles of exposed infrastructure are not an appropriate analysis for this hazard. It should be noted that this map is not a hazard map and should be used for evacuation planning purposes only. The inundation line represents the highest inundation at any particular location from a suite of tsunami sources. It is not representative of any single tsunami.

⁶ Drought will not affect locally owned facilities directly.



Repetitive Loss Properties

There are no repetitive loss properties in the City of Clayton based on 2004 information at the following web address: <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/pickflood.html>.

Other Risks

There are no unreinforced masonry buildings or soft-story apartments located in the City of Clayton.

The City plans to work with ABAG to improve the risk assessment information being compiled by ABAG, including ways to develop specific information about the anticipated level of damage to building, infrastructure and critical facilities which might result from any of the hazards previously noted.

National Flood Insurance Program

The City of Clayton has participated in the National Flood Insurance Program since 1979. The City of Clayton does not participate in the Community Rating System. In 2009, FEMA digitized all National Flood Insurance Program maps in Contra Costa County, including the City of Clayton. Flood zone information, including Base Flood Elevation data, is required for building permits.

Mitigation Goals and Objectives

The goal of the ABAG MJ-LHMP is to maintain and enhance a disaster-resistant region by reducing the potential for loss of life, property damage and environmental degradation from natural disasters while accelerating economic recovery from those disasters. This goal is unchanged from the 2005 plan and continues to be the goal of the City of Clayton in designing its mitigation program.

Additionally, the City has the specific objective of increasing protection of the number of public and private buildings within the City that are vulnerable to the effects of earthquakes.



Mitigation Activities and Priorities

Evaluation of Progress from 2005 Plan

In 2005, mitigation actions and priorities were identified. Due to budget constraints over the past five years, the City has elected to maintain existing hazard mitigation strategy programs but has postponed adding new or expanding existing programs to tackle the additional priorities identified. Note that the City contracts our Building services and as such many of those related strategy activities are covered through Contra Costa County. Fire service activities are covered through the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.

Future Mitigation Actions and Priorities

As a participant in the 2010 ABAG multi-jurisdictional planning process, the staff of the City of Clayton helped in the development and review of the comprehensive list of mitigation strategies in the overall multi-jurisdictional plan. The decision on priority was made based on a variety of criteria, not simply on an economic cost-benefit analysis. These criteria include being technically and administratively feasible, politically acceptable, socially appropriate, legal, economically sound and not harmful to the environment or our heritage. Representatives from multiple departments then met on a regular basis to review progress on the jurisdiction's 2005 strategies to identify and prioritize additional mitigation strategies to update the list.

These draft priorities were submitted to City of Clayton management for review. The draft priorities will be provided to the Clayton City Council for adoption pending approval of this LHMP by FEMA. Strategies are attached as **Exhibit C**.

The City planning team also prioritized specific mitigation tasks for the next five years. This list includes implementation process, funding strategy, responsible department/agency and approximate time frame. Following are the City of Clayton's proposed additional hazard mitigation projects for the next five years:

ENVIRONMENT

- a-10: Provide additional hazardous waste disposal and/or drop-off location information on the City website.
 - o Hazards addressed: EQ, LS, WF, FL, SEC
- b-5: Consider increasing the use of clean, alternative energy by, for example, investing in "green tags", advocating for the development of renewable energy resources and supporting the use of waste to energy technology.
 - o Hazards addressed: LS, WF, FL, DR



- b-6: Consider making energy efficiency a priority through retrofitting city facilities with energy efficient lighting when possible and urging employees to conserve energy and save money.
 - Hazards addressed: LS, WF, FL, DR
- b-9: If funding becomes available, consider attempting to increase the average fuel efficiency of municipal fleet vehicles, reduce the number of vehicles, launch an employee education program including anti-idling messages and convert diesel vehicles to bio-diesel.
 - Hazards addressed: LS, WF, FL, DR

GOVERNMENT

- c-2: Consider encouraging City employees to have a family disaster plan.
 - Hazards addressed: EQ, LS, WF, FL, SEC

HOUSING

- a-4: Consider developing a plan for interim housing for those displaced by working with the Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program (CPGP) that funded this effort in 2009 (estimated completion is 2011).
 - Hazards addressed: EQ, LS, WF, FL, SEC
- g-4: Consider creating or identifying “model” properties showing defensible space and structural survivability in neighborhoods that are wildland-urban interface fire-threatened communities or in areas exposed to high-to-extreme fire threat.
 - Hazards addressed: WF

INFRASTRUCTURE

- d-18: The City is planning to implement a GIS system within the next five years and intends to inventory its existing assets therein. Installation of creek monitoring gauges would be subject to available funding and therefore highly unlikely for the foreseeable future.
 - Hazards addressed: FL

LAND USE

- c-5: Consider encouraging new development near floodways to incorporate a buffer zone or setback from that floodway to allow for changes in stormwater flows in the watershed over time.
 - Hazards addressed: FL

Ongoing Mitigation Strategy Programs

The City has many ongoing mitigation programs that help create a more disaster-resistant region. The following list highlights those programs identified as *Existing Programs* in the mitigation strategy spreadsheet. Others are ongoing programs that are currently underfunded. It is the City’s priority to find additional funding to sustain these ongoing programs over time.

ECONOMY



- e-1: Continue to implement existing development standards to reduce hazards in existing private development in areas exposed to high-to-extreme fire threat through improving engineering design and vegetation management for mitigation, appropriate code enforcement and public education on defensible space mitigation strategies.
- f-2: Continue to implement existing development standards that balance the needs for private commercial and industrial development against the risk from potential flood-related hazards.
- f-3: Continue to implement existing development standards to ensure that new private business development pays its fair share of improvements to the storm drainage system necessary to accommodate increased flows from the development or does not increase runoff by draining water to pervious areas or detention facilities.
- f-4: Continue to provide sandbags and plastic sheeting to private businesses in anticipation of rainstorms, and deliver those materials to vulnerable populations upon request.
- f-5: Continue to provide information to private businesses on locations for obtaining sandbags and deliver those sandbags to those various locations throughout the city prior to large forecast storm events
- f-6: Continue to implement existing development standards to apply floodplain management regulations for private business development in the floodplain and floodway.
- f-7: Continue to encourage private business owners to participate in building elevation programs within flood hazard areas via the City newsletter and community access television.
- f-8: Continue to encourage private business owners to participate in acquisition and relocation programs for areas within floodways as funding opportunities become available.
- g-1: Continue to implement existing development standards for excavation, fill placement, cut-fill transitions, slope stability, drainage and erosion control, slope setbacks, etc., to reduce landslides and erosion in existing and future development of private business property.
- j-1: Continue to provide information to private business owners on the availability of interactive hazard maps on ABAG's website via a link from the City's website.

ENVIRONMENT

- a-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce State-mandated requirements (e.g. CEQA) to ensure that hazard mitigation activities are conducted in a way that reduces environmental degradation such as air quality impacts, noise during construction and loss of sensitive habitats and species, while respecting the community value of historic preservation.
- a-2: Continue to implement existing development standards which encourage regulatory agencies to work collaboratively with safety professionals to develop creative mitigation strategies that effectively balance environmental and safety needs, particularly to meet critical wildfire, flood and earthquake safety levels.
- a-3: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce State-mandated requirements (e.g. CEQA) and environmental regulations to ensure that urban development is conducted in a way to minimize air pollution.
- a-6: Continue to implement existing development standards which comply with applicable performance standards of any NPDES municipal stormwater permit that seeks to manage increases in stormwater runoff flows from new developments and redevelopment construction projects.



- a-7: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce the grading, erosion and sedimentation requirements by prohibiting the discharge of concentrated stormwater flows by other than approved methods that seek to minimize associated pollution.
- a-10: Continue to provide information on hazardous waste disposal and/or drop-off locations via the City newsletter and cable access television.
- a-12: Continue to develop and implement a program to control invasive and exotic species that contribute to fire and flooding hazards (such as eucalyptus, cattails and cordgrass) through vegetation removal, thinning or replacement in hazard areas where there is a direct threat to structures.
- a-13: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce provisions under creek protection, stormwater management and discharge control ordinances designed to keep watercourses free of obstructions and to protect drainage facilities to conform with the RWQCB's Best Management Practices.
- b-3: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space and create compact walkable urban communities.
- b-4: Continue to implement existing development standards which promote transportation options such as bicycle trails, commute trip reduction programs, incentives for car pooling and public transit.
- b-7: Continue to purchase only Energy Star equipment appliances for City use.
- b-11: Continue ongoing program to increase recycling rates in City operations and throughout the community.
- b-12: Continue to maintain healthy urban forests and promote tree planting to increase shading and absorb CO₂.

GOVERNMENT

- a-3: Continue ongoing education program to inform maintenance and emergency personnel, as well as elected officials and the public, of the extent to which the City's critical facilities are expected to perform only at a life safety level or to remain functional following an earthquake.
- a-10: Continue to ensure that new government-owned facilities comply with and are subject to the same or more stringent regulations as imposed on privately-owned development per the requirements of the Contra Costa County Building Department.
- a-11: Continue to comply with all applicable building and fire codes as well as other regulations when constructing or significantly remodeling government-owned facilities per the requirements of the Contra Costa County Building Department and Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.
- b-1: Continue to maintain a framework and process for pre-event planning for post-event recovery that specifies roles, priorities and responsibilities of various departments within the local government organization and that outlines a structure and process for policy-making involving elected officials and appointed advisory committees.
- b-2: Continue to maintain a basic Recovery Plan that outlines the major issues and tasks that are likely to be the key elements of community recovery, and continue to integrate this planning into response planning such as with continuity of operations plans.
- b-3: Continue to maintain a goal for the resumption of local government services that may vary from function to function.
- c-3: Continue to offer CERT training to City employees.



- c-4: Continue to periodically assess the need for new or relocated fire or police stations and other emergency facilities.
- c-5: Continue to periodically assess the need for changes in staffing levels as well as for additional or updated supplies, equipment, technologies and in-service training classes.
- c-6: Continue to ensure that police and maintenance personnel have adequate radios, breathing apparatuses, protective gear and other equipment to respond to a major disaster.
- c-7: Continue to participate in developing and maintaining a system of interoperable communications for first responders from cities, counties, special districts, state and federal agencies.
- c-8: Continue to harden emergency response communications when funding is available, including, for example, building redundant capacity into public safety alerting and/or answering points, replacing or hardening microwave and simulcast systems, adding digital encryption for programmable radios and ensuring a plug-and-play capability for amateur radio.
- c-9: Continue to purchase command vehicles for use as mobile command/EOC vehicles when funding is available if current vehicles are unsuitable or inadequate.
- c-10: Continue to maintain the City's emergency operations center in a fully functional state of readiness.
- c-11: Continue to participate in expanding traditional disaster exercises involving city and county emergency personnel to include transit and infrastructure providers, schools and park districts.
- c-12: Continue to maintain and update as necessary the City's Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) Plan and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) Plan, and submit appropriate NIMSCAST report.
- c-13: Continue to participate not only in general mutual-aid agreements but also in agreements with adjoining jurisdictions for cooperative response to fires, floods, earthquakes and other disasters.
- c-16: Continue to regulate and enforce the location and design of street-address numbers on buildings minimize the naming of short streets (that are actually driveways) to single homes.
- c-25: Continue to support and encourage planning and identification of facilities for the coordination of distribution of water, food, blankets and other supplies, coordinating this effort with the American Red Cross.
- d-1: Continue to promote information sharing among overlapping and neighboring local governments including cities, counties and special district, as well as utilities.
- d-2: Continue to recognize that emergency services involve more than just the coordination of police and fire responses; it also includes planning activities with providers of water, food, energy, transportation, financial, information and public health services.
- d-4: As new flood control projects are completed, continue to request that FEMA revise its flood-insurance rate maps and digital GIS data to reflect flood risks as accurately as possible.
- d-5: Continue participation in the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program.

HEALTH

- c-2: Continue existing training program to ensure employee awareness of the MMRS cities in our area.
- c-3: Continue existing training program to ensure employee awareness of NDMS personnel located within one to four hours of our community.



- c-4: Continue existing training program to plan for hazmat-related issues due to natural or technological disaster.

HOUSING

- a-3: Continue to develop and maintain a plan for short-term sheltering of residents in conjunction with the American Red Cross.
- g-17: Continue to ensure that City Maintenance-initiated fire-preventive vegetation-management techniques and practices for creek sides and high slope areas do not contribute to the landslide and erosion hazard.
- h-2: Continue to implement existing development standards that balance the housing needs of residents against the risk from potential flood-related hazards.
- h-3: Continue to implement existing development standards to ensure that new private residential development pays its fair share of improvements to the storm drainage system necessary to accommodate increased flows from the development or does not increase runoff by draining water to pervious areas or detention facilities.
- h-4: Continue to provide sandbags and plastic sheeting to residents in anticipation of rainstorms, and deliver those materials to vulnerable populations upon request.
- h-5: Continue to provide public information on locations for obtaining sandbags and deliver those sandbags to those various locations throughout the city prior to large forecast storm events.
- h-6: Continue to implement existing development standards to apply floodplain management regulations for private residential development in the floodplain and floodway.
- h-7: Continue to implement existing development standards to ensure new subdivisions are designed to reduce or eliminate flood damage by requiring lots and rights-of-way be laid out for the provision of approved sewer and drainage facilities, providing on-site detention facilities whenever practicable.
- h-8: Continue to encourage home and apartment owners to participate in home elevation programs within flood hazard areas via the City newsletter and community access television.
- h-9: Continue to encourage property owners to participate in acquisition and relocation programs for areas within floodways as funding opportunities become available.
- h-10: Continue to encourage owners of property in floodplains to purchase flood insurance.
- i-1: Continue to implement existing development standards for excavation, fill placement, cut-fill transitions, slope stability, drainage and erosion control, slope setbacks, etc., to reduce landslides and erosion in existing and future development of private residential property.
- k-1: Continue to provide information to residents on the availability of interactive hazard maps on ABAG's website via a link from the City's website.
- k-8: Continue to implement the neighborhood watch block captain and team programs outlined in the Citizen Corps program guide.
- k-12: Continue to utilize the materials on the ABAG website to increase residential mitigation activities related to earthquakes.

INFRASTRUCTURE

- a-5: Continue to write letters and/or pass resolutions of support to encourage other agencies' seismic retrofit and disaster mitigation financing efforts.



- a-8: Continue maintaining emergency power generation capacity at existing critical facilities.
- a-12: Continue enforcement of existing codes requiring all new services to be installed underground.
- a-14: Continue to encourage communication between CalEMA, FEMA and utilities regarding non-regional emergencies that may affect service delivery here.
- a-16: Continue to communicate with the public during heat emergencies to increase awareness of the local transit operator's plans for non-medical transport to nearby cooling centers.
- a-18: Continue participating in the implementation of paratransit-related disaster response and recovery plans and procedures with paratransit providers, emergency responders and public health professionals.
- b-8: Continue to comply with all applicable building and fire codes and other regulations when constructing or significantly remodeling infrastructure facilities.
- b-9: Continue ongoing education program to inform maintenance and emergency personnel, as well as elected officials and the public, of the extent to which the City's critical facilities are expected to perform only at a life safety level or to remain functional following an earthquake.
- c-3: Continue implementation of defensible space vegetation program by Maintenance Department.
- c-4: Continue to enforce fire equipment turn-around standards for new development.
- c-5: Continue to enforce minimum road width and clearance requirements for new development.
- c-6: Continue to require adequate access roads, onsite fire protection systems, evacuation signage and fire breaks on all new development in high fire hazard areas.
- c-7: Continue to ensure adequate fire equipment road or fire road access to developed and open space areas.
- c-8: Continue to maintain fire roads and/or public right-of-way roads and keep them passable at all times.
- d-1: Continue to conduct watershed analyses of runoff and drainage systems to predict areas of insufficient capacity in the storm drain and natural creek system.
- d-2: Continue performing watershed analyses to examine development impacts on downstream flooding potential, including on communities outside of the City's jurisdiction.
- d-4: Continue to write letters and/or pass resolutions of support to encourage other agencies' flood control project development efforts.
- d-7: Continue current maintenance efforts to keep storm drains and creeks free of obstructions while retaining appropriate vegetation in the channel to allow for the free flow of water.
- d-8: Continue enforcement of creek protection, stormwater management and discharge control ordinances.
- e-2: Continue enforcement of existing Hillside Ordinance for future development.
- g-2: Utilize the same procedures for public notification used during road construction projects to provide materials to the public related to planning for delays due to traffic, road closures or transit system disruption caused by disasters.
- g-5: Continue to facilitate and/or coordinate the distribution of emergency preparedness or mitigation materials prepared by others via community access television and the City newsletter.
- g-6: Continue to sponsor the training of Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) for City employees.

LAND USE



- a-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which comply with State-mandated requirements for the preparation of site-specific geologic reports for development proposals within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones and restrict the placement of structures for human occupancy
- a-2: Continue to implement existing development standards which require preparation of site-specific geologic or geotechnical reports for development and redevelopment proposals in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides or liquefaction as mandated by the State Seismic Hazard Mapping Act if applicable, and condition project approval on the incorporation of necessary mitigation measures related to site remediation, structure and foundation design, and/or avoidance.
- a-3: Continue to implement existing development standards which require geologic reports in areas adjacent to locally-significant faults regardless of whether or not they meet the criteria imposed by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act.
- a-4: Continue to implement existing development standards which ensure that development proposed near faults with a history of complex surface rupture has larger setbacks than the minimum fifty feet.
- a-6: Continue to implement existing development standards which require geologic reports in areas mapped by groups other than the California Geological Survey as having significant liquefaction or landslide hazards.
- a-7: Continue to implement existing development standards which support or facilitate efforts by the California Geological Survey to complete the earthquake-induced landslide and liquefaction mapping for the Bay Area.
- a-8: Continue to implement existing development standards which require that local government review of geologic and engineering studies are conducted by appropriately trained and credentialed personnel.
- b-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which ensure that new development proposals incorporate the required and appropriate fire-mitigation measures including adequate provisions for occupant evacuation and access by emergency response personnel and equipment.
- c-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which require site-specific designs and source-control techniques on all new developments to manage peak stormwater runoff flows and impacts from increased runoff volumes.
- c-2: Continue to implement existing development standards which incorporate FEMA guidelines and suggested activities into local government plans and procedures for managing flood hazards.
- c-3: Continue to implement existing development standards which provide an institutional mechanism to ensure that development proposals adjacent to floodways and in floodplains are referred to flood control districts and wastewater agencies for review and comment, consistent with the NPDES program.
- c-4: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce regulations concerning new construction (and major improvements to existing structures) within flood zones in order to be in compliance with federal requirements and potentially eventually be a participant in the Community Rating System of the National Flood Insurance Program.
- d-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce provisions under subdivision ordinances or other means that geotechnical and soil-hazard investigations be conducted and filed to prevent grading from creating unstable slopes, and that any necessary corrective actions be taken prior to development approval.



- d-2: Continue to implement existing development standards which require local government reviews of these geotechnical and soil-hazard investigations be conducted by appropriately trained and credentialed personnel.
- d-3: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce grading, erosion and sedimentation ordinances by requiring, under certain conditions, grading permits and plans to control erosion and sedimentation prior to development approval.
- d-4: Continue to implement existing development standards which enforce provisions under the creek protection, stormwater management and discharge control ordinances designed to control erosion and sedimentation.
- d-5: Continue to implement existing development standards which address hillside development constraints, especially in areas of existing landslides.
- e-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which require a buffer zone between residential properties and landslide or wildfire hazard areas for all new development.
- e-2: Continue to implement existing development standards which discourage, add additional mitigation strategies or prevent new construction or major remodels on slopes greater than a set percentage, such as 15%, due to landslide or wildfire hazard concerns.
- f-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which prioritize retrofit of infrastructure that serves urban areas or urban services areas over constructing new infrastructure to serve outlying areas.
- f-2: Continue to implement existing development standards which work to retrofit homes in older urban neighborhoods to provide safe housing close to job centers.
- f-3: Continue to implement existing development standards which work to retrofit older downtown areas and redevelopment districts to protect architectural diversity and promote disaster resistance.
- f-4: Continue to implement existing development standards which work with non-profits and through other mechanisms to protect as open space those areas susceptible to extreme hazards (such as through land acquisition, zoning and designation as priority conservation areas).
- f-5: Continue to implement existing development standards which strive to preserve existing buffers between development and existing users of large amounts of hazardous materials, such as major industry, due to the potential for catastrophic releases or fires due to an earthquake, accident or terrorism, with alternative mitigation for areas where buffers do not exist or cannot be created.
- g-1: Continue to implement existing development standards which use hazard abatement districts as a funding mechanism to ensure that mitigation strategies are implemented and enforced over time.

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

The City has several planning mechanisms including the following:

- General Plan Safety Element
- Capital Improvements Plan

The City has a Safety Element in its General Plan that includes a discussion of fire, earthquake, flooding and landslide hazards. This plan was adopted as an implementation appendix to the Safety Element. In addition, the



City enforces the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which, since 1988, requires mitigation for identified natural hazards. The City has used these pre-existing programs as a basis for identifying gaps that may lead to disaster vulnerabilities in order to work on ways to address these risks through mitigation.

Plan Update Process

As required by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, the City of Clayton will update this plan annex at least once every five years by participating in a multi-agency effort with ABAG and other agencies to develop a multi-jurisdictional plan.

The Engineering, Maintenance and Police Departments will ensure monitoring of this Annex will occur. The plan will be monitored on an ongoing basis. However, the major disasters affecting our City, legal changes, notices from ABAG as the lead agency in this process and other triggers will be used. Finally, the Annex will be a discussion item on the agenda of the meeting of Department leaders at least once a year in April. At that meeting, the department heads will focus on evaluating the Annex in light of technological and political changes during the past year or other significant events. The Department leaders will be responsible for determining if the plan should be updated.

The City is committed to reviewing and updating this plan annex at least once every five years as required by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The City of Clayton will contact ABAG four years after this plan is approved to ensure that ABAG plans to undertake the plan update process. If so, the City again plans to participate in the multi-jurisdictional plan. If ABAG is unwilling or unable to act as the lead agency in the multi-jurisdictional effort, other agencies will be contacted including the Contra Costa County Office of Emergency Services. Cities and counties should they work together to identify another regional forum for developing a multi-jurisdictional plan.

The public will continue to be involved whenever the plan is updated and as appropriate during the monitoring and evaluation process. Prior to adoption of updates, the City will provide the opportunity for the public to comment on the updates. A public notice will be posted prior to the meeting to announce the comment period and meeting logistics.



Mitigation Plan Points of Contact

	<u>Main Point of Contact</u>	<u>Alternate 1</u>	<u>Alternate 2</u>
Name:	Rick Angrisani	Gary Napper	Dan Lawrence
Title:	City Engineer	City Manager	Chief of Police
Mailing Address:	5375 Clayton Road Concord, CA 94521	6000 Heritage Trail Clayton, CA 94517	6000 Heritage Trail Clayton, CA 94517
Telephone:	925-363-7433	925-673-7300	925-673-7350
Email:	ricka@permcoengineering.com	gnapper@ci.clayton.ca.us	dlawrence@cpd.ci.concord.ca.us



Exhibit A – Jurisdiction Boundary Map





Exhibit B – Public Meeting Announcements



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING

* * *

CLAYTON CITY COUNCIL

TUESDAY, September 1, 2009

7:00 p.m.

*Hoyer Hall, Clayton Community Library
6125 Clayton Road, Clayton, CA 94517*

Mayor: Julie K. Pierce

Vice Mayor: Hank Stratford

Council Members

Howard Geller

Joseph A. Medrano

David T. Shuey

- A complete packet of information containing staff reports and exhibits related to each public item is available for public review in City Hall located at 6000 Heritage Trail on Monday prior to the Council meeting.
- Agendas are posted at: 1) City Hall, 6000 Heritage Trail; 2) Library, 6125 Clayton Road; 3) Ohm's Bulletin Board, 1028 Diablo Street, Clayton; and 4) City Website at www.ci.clayton.ca.us
- Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council after distribution of the Agenda Packet and regarding any public item on this Agenda will be made available for public inspection in the City Clerk's office located at 6000 Heritage Trail during normal business hours.
- If you have a physical impairment that requires special accommodations to participate, please call the City Clerk's office at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at (925) 673-7304.

*** CITY COUNCIL ***
September 1, 2009

7:00 p.m.

1. **CALL TO ORDER CITY COUNCIL** – Mayor Pierce.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – led by Mayor Pierce.

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Consent Calendar items are typically routine in nature and are considered for approval by the City Council with one single motion. Members of the Council, Audience, or Staff wishing an item removed from the Consent Calendar for purpose of public comment, question or input may request so through the Mayor.

(a) **Information Only**

1. Report by City Engineer on Black Diamond Bridge Deck Replacement Project.
([View Here](#))

(b) Approve the minutes of the regular meeting of August 4, 2009. ([View Here](#))

(c) Approve Financial Demands and Obligations of the City. ([View Here](#))

(d) Reject the liability claim of Mr. William Barber for alleged injuries and losses incurred July 24, 2009. ([View Here](#))

(e) Adopt a Resolution approving specific project and operational encumbrances from the FY 08-09 Budget by amending the FY 09-10 City Budget accordingly.
([View Here](#))

4. **RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

(a) Recognition of outgoing Trails and Landscaping Committee members:
Candace Bass, David Disend, David Johnson, and Bill Vineyard.

(b) Proclamation declaring September 2009 as “Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.” ([View Here](#))

5. **REPORTS**

(a) Planning Commission – Commissioner Tuija Catalano.

(b) Trails and Landscaping Committee – Chairperson Virginia Siegel.

(c) City Manager/Staff

(d) City Council - Reports from Council liaisons to Regional Committees,
Commissions and Boards.

(e) Other

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Citizens may address the City Council on items within the Council's jurisdiction, (which are not on the agenda) by completing a speaker card available on the Lobby table and submitting it to the City Clerk. To assure an orderly meeting and an equal opportunity for everyone, each speaker is limited to 3 minutes, enforced at the Mayor's discretion. When one's name is called by the Mayor, the speaker shall approach the public podium and adhere to the time limit. In accordance with State Law, no action may take place on any item not appearing on the posted agenda. The Council may respond to statements made or questions asked, or may request Staff to report back at a future meeting concerning the matter.

Public comment and input on Public Hearing, Action Items and other Agenda Items will be allowed as each item is considered by the City Council.

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- (a) Public Information Meeting and presentation of the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) and its strategic updates in compliance with the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. ([View Here](#))
(City Engineer)

Staff recommendation: Following the PowerPoint presentation and acceptance of public comments, instruct staff to post the Plan to the City's website for additional public outreach and education.

8. **ACTION ITEMS**

- (a) First Reading and Introduction of amendments to Chapter 10.36 – Stopping, Standing and Parking in Title 10 – Vehicles and Traffic of the *Clayton Municipal Code* by adding and deleting certain parking sections to enhance local parking enforcement within the city (Ordinance No. 423). ([View Here](#))
(Police Chief)

Staff recommendations: **1)** Receive the staff report; **2)** Receive Public Comments; **3)** Adopt a motion to have the City Clerk read Ordinance No. 423 by title and number only and waive further reading; **4)** Adopt a motion to approve Ordinance No. 423 for Introduction.

- (b) Presentation and consideration of the City Trails and Landscaping Committee's Annual Report for FY 2008-2009, pursuant to voter approved Measure B (Citywide Landscape Maintenance District, CFD 01-2007). ([View Here](#))
(Chairperson Siegel)

Staff recommendation: Following Committee presentation and public comment, adopt a motion accepting the citizen Committee's Annual Report for 2009.

- (c) Consideration of recommended appointments of citizens to the Trails and Landscaping Committee for a two year term of office expiring on June 30, 2011. (Vice Mayor Stratford and Councilmember Geller) ([View Here](#))

Staff recommendation: Receive the Council Interview Sub-Committee's recommendations of citizen appointments and then by Resolution, approve the appointments for the specified two-year term of office.

- (d) Consideration of City Council position on two (2) proposed General Resolutions for the 2009 Annual Conference, League of CA Cities. ([View Here](#)) (City Manager)

Staff recommendation: Provide direction and input on each General Resolution for the City's Voting Delegate or for written communication to the League of CA Cities.

- (e) Council Member request to discuss and set Council policy regarding the commencement and ending times for public consumption of alcoholic beverages in The Grove Park on Concert days, and consideration of a time limitation for the public's placement of chairs and blankets in The Grove Park on Concert days. (Council Member Medrano) ([View Here](#))

Staff recommendation: That City Council provide and set Concert policies.

9. **COUNCIL ITEMS** – limited to requests and directives for future meetings.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**– the next regularly scheduled City Council meeting is September 15, 2009.

#

MINUTES
OF THE
REGULAR MEETING
CLAYTON CITY COUNCIL

Agenda Date: 9-1-09

Agenda Item: 3b

TUESDAY, August 4, 2009

1. **CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL** – The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Pierce in Hoyer Hall of the Clayton Community Library, 6125 Clayton Road, Clayton, CA. Councilmembers present: Mayor Pierce, Vice Mayor Stratford, Councilmembers Geller, Medrano and Shuey. Staff present: City Manager Gary Napper, Assistant City Attorney Maury Huguet, Community Development Director David Woltering, City Engineer Rick Angrisani and Deputy City Clerk Lynn Cupit.
2. **CLOSED SESSION** – Mayor Pierce announced the following purposes for Closed Session and then adjourned into Closed Session at 6:32 p.m.
 - (a) *Government Code Section 54956.9, Conference with Legal Counsel*
Pending Litigation: *City of Clayton v. McNabb Construction, Inc.*
Case No. MSC-08-02670; Superior Court of CA, Contra Costa County
 - (b) *Government Code Section 54956.8, Conference with Real Property Negotiator*
Real Properties: APNs 119-050-008, 009 & 034 (1005 & 1007 Oak Street)
Instructions to City Negotiator (City Manager) concerning price, terms & conditions
Negotiating Party: Uzoma Nwakuhe, LLB

7:04 p.m. Reports Out From Closed Session: Mayor Pierce reported the Council gave direction to Legal Counsel and the Real Property Negotiator.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – led by Mayor Pierce.
4. **CONSENT CALENDAR-** It was moved by Vice Mayor Stratford, seconded by Councilmember Geller to approve the Consent Calendar as submitted (Passed; 5-0 vote).
 - (a) Approved the minutes of the regular meeting of July 21, 2009.
 - (b) Approved Financial Demands and Obligations of the City.
 - (c) Accepted the City Financial Investment Report for the 4th Quarter of Fiscal Year 2008-2009, ending June 30, 2009.
 - (d) Re-appointed Charles "Chuck" Evans as Clayton's representative to the County Connection Citizen Advisory Committee for a 2-year term expiring on 30 June 2011.
5. **RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS** – None.
6. **REPORTS**
 - (a) Planning Commission – no meeting held to report.
 - (b) Trails and Landscaping Committee – No meeting held to report.
 - (c) The City Manager reported on "State Budget Hits" utilizing a Power Point presentation.

- Administration
 - City Manager
 - City Attorney
 - Job Opportunities
- City Clerk
 - Elections
 - Municipal Code
 - Dog Leash Law
- Community Development
 - Building Permits
 - C&D Recycling
 - Enviro. Reviews
 - Forms & Fees
 - Planning Studies
 - General Plan
 - Specific Plans
 - Zoning Map
 - Downtown Retail Report
- Maintenance
 - Report a Problem
 - Street Light Info.
- Finance
 - Budget
 - Audited Financials
 - Fee Schedule
- Public Works & Engineering
 - Local Hazard

You are here: **Departments / Public Works & Engineering / Local Hazard Mitigation Plan**

Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

The goal of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) is to develop a disaster-resistant region by implementing strategies regionwide that will reduce the potential loss of life, property damage and environmental degradation caused by natural disasters while speeding economic recovery as much as possible.

Led by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the LHMP is being implemented by over 100 local agencies (cities, counties, special districts and utilities, etc.) throughout the Bay Area. The strategies have been organized into 8 categories: Infrastructure, Health, Housing, Economy, Government Services, Education, Environment and Land Use. The City of Clayton's strategies can be found in the following PDF spreadsheets.

Infrastructure

Health

Housing

Economy

Government Services

Education

Environment

Land Use

For more information, please visit <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/>

Please submit any comments, questions or feedback to the Engineering Department at the following email address: chada@permcoengineering.com



Exhibit C – City of Clayton Mitigation Strategies

Included on Multi-Jurisdictional Plan CD and at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/strategy.html>